UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/561,038 | 12/16/2005 | Katsuhito Miura | 2005_1996A | 3768 | |
| | 7590 05/16/201 , LIND & PONACK, I | EXAMINER | | | |
| 1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East | | | LEWIS, BEN | | |
| Washington, Do | C 20005-1503 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 1726 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 05/16/2011 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com eoa@wenderoth.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/561,038 | MIURA ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Ben Lewis | 1726 | |

| | Ben Lewis | 1726 | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>19 April 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance w | , or other evidence, whith 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO | | | | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the control of the c | | 36(a) and the appropriat | e extension fee | | | |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount on the control of the control | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | isideration and/or search (see NOT v); | E below); | | | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | er form for appeal by materially rec | lucing or simplifying the | ne issues for | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | orresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | • | _ | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after en | try is below or attach | ed. | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| /Patrick Joseph Ryan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1726 | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Appplicant states that: As shown in the Rule 132 Declaration by Dr. Miura (hereinafter, "Declaration") submitted herewith, when a large amount of electrolyte solution is combined with the dry, solid electrolyte compositions of Kohjiya, a liquid is obtained and a gel cannot be achieved. Further, when a large amount of electrolyte solution is combined with the dry, solid electrolyte compositions of Miura, a liquid is obtained when the amount of electrolyte solution corresponds to the middle and upper ranges of the presently recited range and therefore, a gel cannot be achieved. Further, even though a gel was obtained when the Miura composition contained an amount of electrolyte solution within the lowest limit (100 parts by weight, based on 100 parts by weight of polymer) of claim 1, such composition was considerably inferior to the presently claimed polymer electrolyte composition.

In response Examiner notes that: Applicant conducted experiments where applicant produced the polymer of Kohijaya (primary reference) and Miura (secondary reference) separately with electrolyte amounts of 100 pbw, 5,000 pbw and 10,00pbw. However, Applicant never produced a polymer using the material of Kohijaya with the crosslinking (optical ingredient) of Miura incorporated which is in line with the rejection on record. Applicant only produced both references polymers separately.